

APPENDIX H EVALUATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE

H-1 INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated Procurement Code requires the State to select Design Professionals (Architects, Engineers, Construction Managers, Land Surveyors, etc.) solely on the basis of seven specific qualification factors, including “past performance.”

The Consolidated Procurement Code requires the State to award construction contracts to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. One of the elements in the State’s standards of responsibility is “a satisfactory record of performance.”

Obviously the State believes that past performance should be a significant factor in determining the level of confidence we should place in an offeror’s promise to perform on a new State contract. In addition, the State may, under certain circumstances, request the substitution of an A/E’s consultant or a contractor’s subcontractor. These requests are typically based on an agency’s prior experience with the firm in question—its past performance. But just what is “Past Performance”? Is an offeror’s past performance a set of facts about an offeror’s past actions, or is it a set of opinions about those actions?

“Past Performance” is a composite of three things: (1) observations of the historical facts of a company’s work experience – what work it did, when and where it did it, whom it did it for, and what methods it used; (2) qualitative judgments about the breadth, depth, and relevance of that experience based on those observations; and (3) qualitative judgments about how well the company performed, also based on those observations. The Federal government does not define past performance per se, but does define “past performance information” in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (42.1501).

Past performance information is relevant information, for future source selection purposes, regarding a contractor's actions under previously awarded contracts. It includes, for example, the contractor's record of conforming to contract requirements and to standards of good workmanship; the contractor's record of forecasting and controlling costs; the contractor's adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; the contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and generally, the contractor's business-like concern for the interest of the customer.

While it is one thing to know the facts of what happened in a company’s past – the who, what, when, where and how – it is an entirely different thing to understand the meaning and relevance of those facts, since they took place within a context that may be difficult for an outsider to reconstruct or understand. Most organizations do not keep extensive files of factual information about contractor past performance. Some organizations may record only their employees’ judgments about how well a contractor performed, with no comment or explanation from the contractor.

The Office of State Engineer has developed the Performance Evaluation procedure to systematically evaluate the performance of designers and contractors on State building projects and to compile a record of a firm’s past performance. This procedure has been developed to assist the Office of State Engineer and State Agencies in fulfilling their respective duties, and is not intended to create or confer any rights to any party.

The following two sections discuss the evaluation processes for design professionals and contractors and provide guidance to Agency evaluators.

H-2 EVALUATION OF DESIGN PROFESSIONAL PAST PERFORMANCE

H-2.1 KEY FEATURES

The following key features were incorporated into the A/E Performance Evaluation System.

H-2.1.1 CONSISTENCY AND FAIRNESS.

The goal of the evaluation process is to measure a design professional's performance fairly and consistently based on factual information. The evaluation may contain both objective and subjective judgments that must be in written form and, to the extent possible, documented by facts. Evaluations will be used in the A/E selection process and to help improve A/E performance.

H-2.1.2 BASIS FOR MEASUREMENT.

The A/E's performance will be measured relative to the requirements of the A/E's contract and the Manual for Planning and Execution of State Permanent Improvements, Part II (OSE Manual). This will provide a firm basis for measurement and will make evaluation less subjective.

H-2.1.3 PROJECT-SPECIFIC WEIGHTING SYSTEM.

The same performance elements will be evaluated for every project, but the elements will be weighted differently for each type of project, based on the importance of the element to the success of the specific project. This tailored system will provide a more accurate assessment of a A/E's performance in response to the needs of individual projects. The Agency and the A/E will select the Project Type and element weightings at the time of contract award. The OSE Project Manager will provide input to the weightings chosen.

H-2.1.4 PROJECT PHASE EVALUATIONS

The typical A/E contract presents different challenges to the A/E, each calling for a different set of technical and managerial skills. The A/E will be evaluated on its performance in three basic areas: Design Development; Preparation of Construction Documents and Bidding; and Construction Administration. If the scope of a specific contract does not involve all of these, then the evaluation can be tailored to the actual scope of work.

H-2.1.5 TOTAL TEAM PERFORMANCE RATINGS.

State projects typically involve a prime design professional and several consultants, each of whom must perform well for the project to succeed. The Agency will evaluate Prime A/E's for their overall project performance, including the performance of their Consultants. The Agency Project Manager should obtain input from the agency's technical staff and facility users in developing their evaluations. Consultants will be evaluated by the Agency for their contribution in their respective technical areas. Evaluation ratings will be accompanied by review comments.

H-2.1.6 PROJECTS TO BE EVALUATED.

A/E's will be evaluated on all major projects (over \$100,000); including Indefinite Delivery Contracts, where they are working on a State project for the first time; and on selected smaller projects. A/E's may also be evaluated based on request from the A/E's themselves or as determined by OSE.

H-2.1.7 TIME LIMITATION.

A/E Performance Evaluations will be retained for a period of five years after final completion of the project or termination of the contract.

H-2.2 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

H-2.2.1 PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FORMS.

As part of contract negotiations, the Agency and the A/E shall discuss the relative importance of each evaluation category and the nature and complexity of the project and then complete the SE-290 with the weight factors assigned to each phase and category. The SE-290 must be submitted to the OSE along with the SE-220 for the project.

H-2.2.2 COLLECTION AND DISPOSITION OF INFORMATION.

The Agency Project Manager shall evaluate the A/E's performance and provide the A/E and the OSE with the SE-290 completed with the rating for each phase and category shown. The SE-290, along with any comments, should be

completed within 30 days after completion of each phase of the project. Evaluations will be placed in the A/E Performance Evaluation Record File, with copies in the Record Files for each Consultant.

H-2.2.3 A/E RESPONSE.

If they desire, the A/E or any Consultant may submit responses to the evaluation, which will be placed in the appropriate Performance Evaluation Record File without further comment or response.

H-2.2.4 UNACCEPTABLE EVALUATIONS.

If any of the performance elements are rated 0 to 1 or if the overall performance rating is below 40% on any phase, the evaluation will be considered an Unacceptable Evaluation. The OSE Project Manager and State Engineer will review the Unacceptable Evaluation, along with the A/E's Performance Evaluation file for possible further action.

H-2.2.4.1 ACTION TAKEN ON UNACCEPTABLE EVALUATIONS.

After review of the Unacceptable Evaluation(s), OSE will determine, in its sole discretion, which one or more of the following actions may be taken:

1. Allow future contract award(s) without further action.
2. Request the A/E to meet with OSE to discuss areas needing improvement.
3. Refer the issues to the appropriate professional licensing board.
4. Initiate debarment action under §11-35-4220 of the Procurement Code.

The A/E will immediately be informed in writing of any action taken by the OSE.

H-2.2.4.2 RE-EVALUATION.

The OSE may, in its sole discretion, re-evaluate an Unacceptable Evaluation. In this event, the OSE will ask the A/E to submit documentation necessary to support a more favorable evaluation. The State Engineer will notify the A/E of the results of this review as soon as practicable. The document submitted by the A/E will be attached to and become a part of the A/E's Record File.

H-2.3 EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The following list of key points for each evaluation component has been developed to help the individual completing the evaluation form. These points are based upon OSE Manual and standard A/E contract language. An A/E or Consultant whose performance displays all the following attributes in an exemplary manner should receive the highest possible score.

H-2.3.1 DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE.

This phase requires the A/E to demonstrate strong listening skills, perform careful and thorough investigations of existing conditions and constraints, to apply creative thinking to reconcile the agency's program and budget goals, to integrate the technical requirements of many disciplines and to show strong cost control and estimating skills in the face of design uncertainty.

H-2.3.1.1 Depth of Program Review/Understanding.

The A/E developed a clear understanding of the agency's program, made a thorough investigation of all technical aspects, the program quantity and quality, all as compared to the Agency's construction budget. Identified key issues and major schedule compliance concerns. Identified discrepancies or errors and recommended cost-effective solutions. Identified significant points of design and construction as they relate to the Agency's needs.

H-2.3.1.2 Development and Analysis of Options.

The A/E conducted site visits. Explored multiple options. Scale and relationship of project components was appropriate. Developed pros and cons list for all options. Provided systems evaluation. Incorporated flexibility and adaptability into the design approach. Made effective presentation to the agency. Provided effective written responses to agency and OSE input. Developed accurate cost estimates related to options. Context and scale of project were appropriate to the approved budget.

H-2.3.1.3 Document Quality and Coordination

Prepared drawings, details, analysis and outline specifications adequate to describe the size and character of the entire project as defined in the OSE Manual. Developed the structural mechanical, electrical and other system designs and material and equipment usage. Documents were complete, well coordinated, with appropriate sections and details. Base Bid scope conforms to agency's programmatic and budgetary goals.

H-2.3.1.4 Response to Review Comments.

Provided written reply to all comments. Incorporated "agree-to" changes promptly. Further studied options as requested.

H-2.3.1.5 Estimate/Schedule Development & Update.

Provided detailed estimates as required by the OSE Manual, with costs allocated by system or specification division. Demonstrated understanding of bidding climate and other factors and provided appropriate contingency analysis and recommendations. Estimate at the completion of design met agency budget goals. Made realistic recommendations of appropriate bid alternates.

H-2.3.1.6 Architectural Design Merit.

Design solution demonstrates sensitivity to functional and aesthetic qualities, internal circulation, space relationships, flexibility, materials used and site development.

H-2.3.1.7 Engineering Design Merit.

Developed the engineering concept and integrated with the architectural concept. Provided for expansion capability. Provided systems designs with appropriate flexibility, durability, maintainability and design life. Developed life cycle cost comparisons, when required.

H-2.3.2 CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS/BID PHASE.

This phase of a project requires the A/E to demonstrate excellent quality control skills to translate the conceptual and preliminary design work of the previous phase into a complete and well-coordinated set of construction documents, to use those documents to prepare a final estimate with a high degree of confidence that the project can be awarded within the agency's budget and to conduct the bidding process effectively.

H-2.3.2.1 Document Quality and Completeness.

Documents convey full and complete understanding of the construction, well cross-referenced, good coordination between specifications and drawings. Provided complete specifications.

H-2.3.2.2 Document Coordination.

Coordination between various consultants was evident in plans and specifications. Documents were well integrated between architectural, mechanical, electrical, and other trades.

H-2.3.2.3 Estimate Update/Detail.

Confirmed costs and schedule established in preliminary design. Suggested alternates to reduce cost as necessary. The Final cost estimate for each bid item was accurate to within the range +10% to - 5% of the actual bid amount of the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. Project was bid within budget. Adequate contingency was maintained.

H-2.3.2.4 Ability to Meet Schedules.

Maintained schedule established at start of project and provided quality meeting notes and other documents in a timely manner.

H-2.3.2.5 Design Merit/Technical Design.

Sensitive to functional and aesthetic qualities, site development, internal circulation, space relationships, use of materials. Detailing, scale, proportions and context were appropriate to building. Completed design documents reflect compliance with all applicable codes and regulations.

H-2.3.2.6 Responses to Agency, OSE and Bidders.

Provided written responses to all comments in a timely manner. Incorporate "agreed-to" changes. Participated in productive review meetings. Provided timely answers to bidder questions and conducted pre-bid tour, where required.

H-2.3.2.7 Communication

Cooperative spirit, kept project manager informed at all times, readily available. Addenda were timely, used to make corrections or clarifications, but not used to finish the project documents.

H-2.3.3 CONSTRUCTION PHASE.

The phase requires that the A/E conduct effective site meetings, respond promptly and effectively to requests and facilitate the translation of its design into a finished project.

H-2.3.3.1 Participation in Meetings.

Conducted well organized meetings, described goals and identified key issues, noted construction concerns, discussed schedule.

H-2.3.3.2 Communications.

Cooperative spirit, available to agency field staff, kept field staff and project manager informed, good working relationship with contractors.

H-2.3.3.3 Response to Requests for Information.

Responded in a timely manner to requests for information, provided adequate interpretations to questions, provided adequate back-up data.

H-2.3.3.4 Observation and Reporting.

Visited site as required by contract and actual job conditions and progress. Visit duration was adequate for A/E to become familiar with progress and quality. Answered questions and provided supplementary drawings to the field. Produced timely and well-written field reports. Pay requests processed promptly and accurately, reflecting independent opinion of work completed acceptably.

H-2.3.3.5 Error and Omission Follow-up.

Changes required by design errors and omissions were typical of similar size and type project. A/E provided prompt resolution of errors, omissions and ambiguities in the construction documents.

H-2.3.3.6 As-Built Drawings, Manuals and Schedules.

Produced complete and accurate construction record drawings in a timely manner. Obtained and submitted operations manuals and other project close-out documents as required. Provided effective review of the Contractor's proposed schedule and progress revisions.

H-2.4 DEFINITION OF PROJECT TYPES

The Project Type will be assigned based on the scope of the A/E's assignment. For example, an A/E contracted to design a portion of a larger project will be assigned a project type that reflects the actual scope of the A/E's services.

H-2.4.1 COMPLEX PROJECTS.

This includes fine arts facilities, hospitals, laboratory buildings, libraries, medical facilities, prisons, science buildings, student unions, sports facilities, and theaters. Large environmental remediation projects may be complex, based on individual project requirements.

H-2.4.2 ADDITION/REMODELING PROJECTS.

This includes all types of remodeling and/or additions to existing buildings, including normal hazardous materials abatement work.

H-2.4.3 MAJOR MECHANICAL PROJECTS.

These types of projects include boiler and chiller replacement, new power plants, utility tunnels, utility system replacement and/or upgrade.

H-2.4.4 STANDARD PROJECTS.

This includes facilities such as dormitories, educational facilities, food service facilities, maintenance and stores, office buildings, and physical education buildings.

H-2.4.5 UTILITARIAN PROJECTS.

This includes such projects as agricultural buildings, armories, civil-environmental projects, parking garages, shop buildings, warehouses, and vehicle storage.

H-2.4.6 REMEDIAL WORK.

This includes all types of remedial work including building window replacement, envelope repairs, foundation repairs, repointing masonry, and roof replacement.

H-3 EVALUATION OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE

H-3.1 KEY POINTS

H-3.1.1 CONSISTENCY AND FAIRNESS.

The goal of the evaluation is to measure Contractor and Subcontractor performance fairly and consistently based on factual information. The evaluation may contain both objective and subjective judgments, which must be in written form and, to the extent possible, documented by facts.

H-3.1.2 BASIS FOR MEASUREMENT.

The Contractor's performance will be measured considering general industry practices and the requirements of the contract documents including, but not limited to the technical specifications, drawings, specified completion date, and policies and procedures associated with the contract documents, including the Manual for Planning and Execution of State Permanent Improvements, Part II (OSE Manual).

H-3.1.3 PROJECT-SPECIFIC WEIGHTING SYSTEM.

The same performance elements will be evaluate for every project, but the elements may be weighted differently for each type of project, based on the importance of the element to the success of the specific project. While the element weightings will be the same for most projects, this tailored system will provide a more accurate assessment of a Contractor's performance in response to the needs of individual projects. During the Pre-construction meeting the Agency and the Contractor will determine the weights to be given each category.

H-3.1.4 TEAM RATINGS.

Agency Project Managers will evaluate Prime Contractors for their overall project performance, including the performance of their Subcontractors. The Agency Project Manager should obtain input from the agency's field and technical staff and facility users in developing their evaluations. Subcontractors will be evaluated by the Agency for their contribution in their respective areas. Evaluation ratings will be accompanied by review comments.

H-3.1.5 PROJECTS TO BE EVALUATED.

Contractors and Subcontractors will be evaluated on projects where the contract price exceeds \$100,000, on Indefinite Delivery Contracts, or where they are working on a State project for the first time. Contractors may also be evaluated based on request from the contractors themselves or as determined by OSE.

H-3.1.6 TIME LIMITATION.

Contractor Performance Evaluations will be retained for a period of five years after the one-year warranty inspection of the project.

H-3.2 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

H-3.2.1 PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FORMS.

As part of the pre-construction process the Agency and the Contractor and its major subcontractors shall meet to discuss their mutual goals for the project. The Agency will then assign the appropriate weight factors to the evaluation categories of the SE-495 based on the project type and complexity. Copies of the SE-495 to the A/E, the Contractor and the OSE. The Agency Project Manager is responsible for form distribution and solicitation of comments from other agency staff for evaluating contractors.

H-3.2.2 COLLECTION AND DISPOSITION OF INFORMATION.

The Agency Project Manager shall evaluate the Contractor's performance and provide the rating for each category shown on the SE-495, along with any comments within 30 days after final payment on the contract. The SE-495 will be placed in the Contractor Performance Evaluation Record File, with copies in each Subcontractor's Record File. The OSE Project Manager will enter the data provided into the Contractor Performance Evaluation Record file.

H-3.2.3 CONTRACTOR RESPONSE.

A copy of each completed evaluation will be given to the Contractor, if requested. If they desire, the Contractor or any Subcontractor may submit responses to the evaluation, which will be placed in the appropriate Performance Evaluation Record File.

H-3.2.4 UNACCEPTABLE EVALUATIONS.

If any of the performance elements are rated 0 or 1, or if the overall performance rating is below 40%, the evaluation will be considered an Unacceptable Evaluation. The OSE Project Manager and State Engineer will review the Unacceptable Evaluation, along with the Contractor's (or Subcontractor's) Performance Evaluation File for possible further action.

H-3.2.4.1 ACTION TAKEN ON UNACCEPTABLE EVALUATIONS.

After review of the Unacceptable Evaluation(s), OSE will determine, in its sole discretion, which one or more of the following actions may be taken:

1. Allow future contract award (s) without conditions.
2. Request the Contractor or Subcontractor to meet with OSE to discuss areas needing improvement.
3. Refer the issues to the Contractors' Licensing Board.
4. Initiate debarment action under §11-35-4220 of the Procurement Code.

The Contractor will be promptly informed in writing of the action of any action taken by the OSE.

H-3.2.4.2 RE-EVALUATION.

The OSE may, in its sole discretion, re-evaluate an Unacceptable Evaluation. In this event, the OSE will ask the Contractor to submit documentation necessary to support a more favorable evaluation. The State Engineer will notify the Contractor of the results of this review as soon as practicable. The documents submitted by the Contractor will be attached to and become a part of the Contractor's Record File.

H-3.3 REVIEWS OF PAST PERFORMANCE**H-3.3.1 PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE CHECK.**

Prior to posting the Notice of Intent to Award, the awarding Agency Procurement Officer may review the past performance of the apparent low bidder to determine whether that firm has met standards of performance necessary to be considered a "responsible bidder". The Agency shall then make the appropriate judgment and advise the bidder accordingly.

H-3.3.2 SUBCONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE CHECKS.**H-3.3.2.1 PRE-AWARD EVALUATIONS.**

Prior to posting the Notice of Intent to Award, the awarding Agency Procurement Officer should review the past performance of the listed Subcontractors to determine whether they have met the standards of performance necessary for the Prime Contractor to be considered a "responsible bidder". The Agency shall then make the appropriate judgment and advise the Contractor accordingly.

H-3.3.2.2 POST-AWARD EVALUATIONS.

After award, if a Subcontractor, listed or otherwise, is found not to be acceptable, the Agency may instruct the Prime Contractor to replace the unacceptable Subcontractor with other Subcontractors, in accordance with the terms of the contract and as allowed by the Procurement Code. Substitute Subcontractors shall also be subject to approval in the same manner.

H-3.4 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The following list of key points for each evaluation component has been developed to help the individual in completing the evaluation form. These points are based upon OSE Manual and standard construction contract language. A Contractor displaying all the following in an exemplary manner should receive the highest possible score. Conversely, a Contractor may allocate a majority of resources to several elements at the expense of others. For the successful completion of a project all elements need to be performed at a satisfactory level.

H-3.4.1 SCHEDULE.

The key is timeliness of performance considering all the factors, controllable and uncontrollable, that can influence the length of a construction project. The evaluator should assess whether the Contractor worked according to a well-developed Project Schedule and provided accurate updates to that schedule on a periodic basis. The evaluator should

consider all of the factors which can be involved in whether the Project was completed on or before the agreed upon Project Completion Date.

1. Did the Contractor provide a satisfactory Project Schedule as required by the Contract?
2. Was a complete Project Schedule developed and published as required?
3. Were monthly updates of the Project Schedule developed, analyzed, and published by the Contractor?
4. Did the Project Schedule incorporate all activities, events, and milestones required for successful Project completion in the format and level of detail required by the Contract?
5. Was the Project completed within the Contract Completion Date, as modified by change orders?

H-3.4.2 QUALITY.

The Contractor is expected to performance to the Contract requirements and demonstrate high levels of workmanship and provide materials and equipment compliant with the Contract. Contractor or Subcontractor personnel assigned to the Project are expected to be competent and appropriate in the discipline for which they are responsible. The Contractor should demonstrate a positive approach to quality construction.

1. Was an approved Subcontractor or material supplier replaced without proper notice?
2. If the Contractor used an "Equal or Substitution" of material, equipment, or processes, was proper notification given prior to usage?
3. When a substitution was used, did the Contractor provide documentation verifying the adequacy of the substitution according with Contract Document specifications?
4. Was the Contractor in compliance with all-applicable State laws, codes, and regulations relating to environmental quality?
5. Did the Contractor provide a quality control inspection system and method of implementation at the Pre-Construction meeting?
6. Did the Contractor perform a complete inspection of the Project to determine if the Work completed was in compliance with the Contract Documents prior to the Notice and Request for Inspection being issued to the Agency and the OSE?
7. Were complete construction records, inspection records and test data maintained by the Contractor in compliance with the terms of the contract documents?

H-3.4.3 COST.

The Contractor should support and work with the Agency and the A/E in project cost control and financial management. The evaluator should consider the relationship of the Contract's awarded cost to actual cost and the number and cause of change orders issued and the manner in which the Contractor priced the change orders. The Contractor should contribute in any cost containment initiatives and provide appropriate financial documents as required.

1. Did the Contractor submit complete, current, and accurate billings, supported by any required information?
2. Did the Contractor provide the Agency with costs for all Change Orders as outlined in OSE Manual?
3. Did any supplier or subcontractor file a complaint against the project because of non-payment by the Contractor?
4. Was the original contract and any/all of its additional change orders invoiced accurately and within the guidelines of the original contract and all changes?

H-3.4.4 SAFETY.

The Contractor must maintain a work environment which safeguards the public and State personnel as well as material and equipment from injury or damage. The evaluator should assess the Contractor's positive and effective safety programs, housekeeping and inspections. Project Work must be performed in accordance with all applicable governmental safety regulations.

1. Was it necessary to issue a notice to the Contractor regarding a condition caused by the Contractor which posed serious and imminent danger to the health and safety of the public or State personnel?
2. Did a serious injury or fatality occur at the construction site?
3. Does the Contractor have a safety awareness program?
4. Were safety and housekeeping inspections conducted at appropriate intervals?
5. Was the Contractor cited for non-conformance of any Federal, State, or local safety requirements?
6. Did the Contractor provide adequate safety barricades, signs, traffic control, and signal lights at the Project site?

H-3.4.5 RELATIONSHIPS.

This element assesses both the interaction of the Contractor with State personnel as well as other Contractors and Subcontractors working on the Project. The evaluator should consider the coordination and cooperation which the Contractor displays towards other Contractors, Trades, and State personnel.

1. Did the Contractor attend the pre-construction meeting?
2. Was the continuous superintendence provided by the Contractor or designated representative at the Work site?
3. Did the Contractor foster a positive atmosphere on the construction site, at all meetings and in communications with the Agency and the A/E?

H-3.4.6 COMMUNICATION.

Effective communication is essential for a successful project, especially how the Contractor relates project information to all parties involved with the Project. This may take place in the form of informational meetings, document submittals and routing. Inherent to the effectiveness of the communication process is the timeliness of the information flow.

1. Did the Contractor conduct regular foreman's meetings with the trades?
2. Did the Contractor provide a submittal register at the Pre-Construction meeting?
3. Did the Prime Contractor provide a copy of the Project Schedule immediately upon publication or update to each Subcontractor, the Agency, the A/E and others who perform work on the Project?
4. Did the Contractor acknowledge or respond to communications from the Agency or the A/E promptly and completely?

H-3.4.7 DOCUMENTATION.

Hard copy documentation of Project-related information. These can be Project Schedules, and all related forms and reports regarding the Project, if requested. In addition to documents, this can include instruction and training. At Project close-out or Punchlist closeout, As-Built drawings, Warranty information as well as others need to be delivered.

1. Did the Contractor convey to the State a good title on all materials used in the Work, free of liens and encumbrances or any other claims?
2. Was the Punchlist work completed within the time allowed by contract?
3. Were the Operating and Maintenance Manuals and Instructions complete and delivered in good order and timely?
4. Were the proper Warranty documents and other information presented?
5. Was the information necessary to allow the A/E to prepare "As-Built" drawings delivered complete, accurate and timely?
6. Was training provided to the Agency's staff in the proper operation and maintenance of the work?